



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/499,401	02/07/2000	Yukako Nii	49570(551)	1212

-7590 11/19/2002

DIKE BRONSTEIN ROBERT & CUSHMAN
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP
EDWARDS & ANGELL
PO BOX 9169
BOSTON, MA 02209

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

VU, THANH T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/499,401	NII, YUKAKO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanh T Vu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 11 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 - 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment A, filed 10/13/02.
2. In the amendment, filed 09/13/02, Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 17 were amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, 16, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 5,777,616) in view of Hirose (U.S. 5,745,112).
5. Per Claim 1, Bates teaches an information processing apparatus comprising: a pointing device; a display unit displaying a plurality of icons; a detection unit detecting a predetermined operation performed on a first icon which has been dragged to a second icon, said first icon displayed on said display unit and moved with movement of said pointing device (Figs. 4B; *icons: 114, 150*; Col. 7, lines 23-25), but does not teach a condition update unit changing a processing condition of the information processing, represented by the second icon, to be performed on said first icon based on the detection of the operation performed on the first icon. However, Hirose teaches an information processing apparatus wherein a condition update unit changing a processing condition of the information processing, represented by the second iconic menu, to be performed on said first icon based on the detection of the operation performed on the first icon (Figs 13 and 14; Col. 6, lines 44 – 56). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a condition update unit as taught by Hirose in the invention of Bates in order to display only relevant icons for information processing based on dragging operation done on another icon.

6. Per claim 2, Bates teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said detection unit detects movement of said first icon in a predetermined direction in the vicinity of said second icon while said first icon is being dragged (Col. 7, lines 42 –56).

1. Per claim 6, Bates teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said display unit displays a processing condition associated with said second icon in the vicinity of said second icon (Fig 4B; Col. 7, lines 47-49).

2. Per claim 7, Bates teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a processing execution unit executing processing based on the processing condition in information processing updated by said condition update unit (Fig 6; Col. 9, lines 5-8).

3. Per claim 8, Bates teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said second icon includes a group of icons associated with said processing condition (Fig 4A; Icon: 150).

4. Per claim 9, Bates teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 8, wherein at least one of said first icon, said second icon and said group of icons is preliminary associated with said processing condition (Fig 6; Col.8, lines 10-13).

5. Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 1 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 8 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 1 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

8. Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 8 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.
9. Claims 3-5, 12, 15, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Hirose (U.S. 5,745,112) and Fitzpatrick et al ("Fitzpatrick", U.S. Pat. No. 5,546,527).
10. With respect to claim 3, Bates and Hirose teach the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, but do not specifically teach a detection unit detects stop of said first icon for a predetermined time in the vicinity of said second icon while said first icon is being dragged. However, Fitzpatrick shows a detection of an icon that is stopped in the vicinity of another icon while the first icon is being dragged (Col. 4, lines 9-14). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a detection unit as taught by Fitzpatrick the inventions of Bates and Hirose in order to detect a hovering action of an icon over another icon.
11. Per claim 5, Bates and Hirose teach the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, but do not specifically teach said display unit changes a display form of said second icon according to a set processing condition. Fitzpatrick teaches changing display form of an icon graphics such as by slightly enlarging the icon or by providing a flashing icon (Col. 3, lines 64-66). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize Fitzpatrick's teaching to include changing display form of an icon according to a set processing condition in the invention of Bates and Hirose in order to provide users a visual clue for an icon's characteristics.
12. Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.
13. Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 5, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

14. Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 5, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

15. Claims 4, 10, 14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Hirose and Smith (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,853).

16. Per claim 4, Bates and Hirose teach the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, but do not specifically teach wherein said display unit displays said second icon as a group of icons associated with said processing condition when said detection unit detects said predetermined operation. Smith teaches said display unit displays said second icon as a group of icons associated with said processing condition when said detection unit detects said predetermined operation (Figs 1, 2, and 3B; Col. 4, lines 45-51). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include said display unit displays said second icon as a group of icons associated with said processing condition when said detection unit detects said predetermined operation as taught by Smith in the inventions of Bates and Hirose in order to save screen space by only showing the second icon as group of icons when needed.

17. Per claim 10, Bates and Hirose teach the information processing apparatus according to claim 8, but do not specifically teach wherein a combination of a plurality of processing conditions is set for each icon of said group of icons. However, Smith teaches a combination of a plurality of processing conditions is set for each icon of said group of icons (Figs. 4, 5, and 6; Col. 6, lines 13-16). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Smith's teaching in the inventions of Bates and Hirose in order to let users set a plurality of processing conditions for each icon in a group of icons.

18. Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 4 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

19. Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 4 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claim 11 is allowed.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 12-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T Vu whose telephone number is (703)-308-9119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-746-7239 for regular communications and (703)-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

TVu
November 12, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100